

**Empire Justice Center
Legal Services NYC
Neighborhood Economic Development Advocacy Project
South Brooklyn Legal Services
Western New York Law Center**

December 24, 2009

Jennifer J. Johnson
Secretary
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System
20th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20551

Re: Truth in Lending – Proposed Rule: Regulation Z Part 226; Docket No. R-1367

Dear Members of the Federal Reserve Board:

The undersigned consumer advocates provide the following comments on the proposed changes to the regulations under the Truth in Lending Act. We work for legal services and advocacy organizations in New York. Our organizations assist thousands of homeowners each year who are at risk of foreclosure. Through litigation and advocacy, we have been able to save hundreds of homeowners from foreclosure.

The Board's proposed changes in rules and timing for open-end credit are deeply flawed. The Board's proposal would allow creditors to make HELOC loans with *no advance disclosures*. Allowing open end home secured credit to be made with such minimal disclosure requirements will simply encourage predatory lenders to shift to using open end credit – which is just as dangerous for consumers and the economy as predatory closed-end credit has been.

Additionally, we strongly oppose the Board's proposal for a weak, nothing-in APR for open-end credit. Here the Board proposes to put *no up front fees or charges in the APR*. This is directly contrary to the approach of the "all-in" finance charge in the closed end proposals. Creating this tremendous gap in meaningful regulation between closed and open end home secured credit will make it impossible for consumers to compare the products.

Changes for Open-End Credit is Based on Wrong Assumptions. Unlike the changes proposed by the Board for closed-end credit disclosures, the changes for open-end credit are deeply flawed. If adopted, this proposal will do a great deal of harm. It will not only enable HELOC lending to become much more abusive, but will also undermine the Board's innovative proposals for closed-end credit – because the abuses will simply migrate to the less regulated open-end credit market. The Board's HELOC proposal requires major revision.

The Board bases its flawed approach for HELOC changes on the mistaken idea that HELOC borrowers seek out HELOCs. Borrowers in the subprime market are most often provided HELOCs as part of 80-20 financing deals. The lender finances 80% of the obligation with a closed-end mortgage, and the remaining 20% with a HELOC. This may be a home purchase or a refinance, but the bottom line is that the borrower is highly leveraged, with no equity cushion. The borrower rarely understands the terms of the deal before closing, or even that there are two loans, and is never made aware that one of the loans is a HELOC. For example, one New York State homeowner sought assistance from a local real estate broker to purchase his first home. The broker promised to take care of everything for the homeowner, showing him several homes for sale and taking the necessary documentation for the mortgage. The homeowner thought he was purchasing a home for \$444,000 with one mortgage. Several months after the closing the homeowner found out he had actually been given two loans, the second a home equity line of credit for more than \$100,000 with a very high interest rate. This homeowner's situation is not unique. HELOCs are frequently a line of credit in name only, as often nearly the entire amount available is drawn down at closing. The Board has completely failed to deal with this subprime HELOC market—the market where abuses are most likely to occur.

Additionally, the Board treats HELOCs as an alternate form of credit card, not an alternate form of mortgage. Again, this view ignores the subprime market, where HELOCs are primarily sold as part of a mortgage transaction. They are sold along with closed-end mortgages in 80-20 transactions. By allowing HELOC lenders to state an APR that does not include fees, the Board is blessing a disclosure regime that will make HELOC APRs appear lower than the APRs for comparable closed-end mortgages, giving consumers the *false impression that the HELOC rate is lower*.

The Board's proposal is a recipe for abuse. Brokers will be able to steer borrowers into HELOCs and provide the terms of the HELOC only at closing. HELOCs that are used to purchase a home will not be rescindable, so home purchasers who sign a fully-drawn HELOC at closing will have no escape. Brokers will be able to mislead borrowers by selling HELOCs as cheaper than closed-end loans by showing borrowers the HELOC APR, which will look lower only because the two APRs are defined differently. Lenders could even offer a consumer a plain-vanilla fixed-rate closed end loan to purchase a home, and then switch the borrower to a subprime HELOC at closing. Bad lending will migrate to HELOCs, undermining the true reforms that the Board has proposed for closed-end lending.

Based on this blindness toward the part of the market where the greatest abuses occur, the Board has decided to *dispense with all early disclosures about HELOCs*. Instead, the Board is giving its blessing to the practice of giving the borrower the first and only disclosures about the terms of the HELOC *at closing*.

It is disappointing that in the midst of the current disaster in the mortgage market, even with the obvious problems caused by essentially unsecured second mortgages, the Board does not appear to recognize the dangers of home secured open-end credit. The Board's proposal on open-end credit reduces rather than increases protections for consumers from open-end credit lines. Instead, the Board should be mandating disclosures equivalent to closed-end credit, along

with substantive protections such as requiring creditors to evaluate the borrower's ability to pay all home secured credit.

There are many other issues which merit comment; for those, we refer the Board to the comprehensive comments provided by the National Consumer Law Center.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Meghan Faux
Director, Foreclosure Prevention Project
South Brooklyn Legal Services

Kirsten Keefe
Senior Staff Attorney
Empire Justice Center

On behalf of
Empire Justice Center
Legal Services NYC
Neighborhood Economic Development Advocacy Project
South Brooklyn Legal Services
Western New York Law Center